



**SCOTTSDALE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
KIVA - CITY HALL
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD
DECEMBER 1, 2005
DRAFT REGULAR SESSION MINUTES**

PRESENT: Wayne Ecton, Council Member
E.L. Cortez, Vice-Chairman (departed at 2:15 p.m.)
Eric Hess, Commission Member
Michael D'Andrea, Development Member
Kevin O'Neill, Development Member
Michael Schmitt, Design Member
Jeremy A. Jones, Design Member

STAFF: Donna Bronski
Mac Cummins
Tim Curtis
Lusia Galav
Dan Symer
Al Ward

CALL TO ORDER

The regular session of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was called to order by Councilman Ecton at 1:02 p.m.

ROLL CALL

A formal roll call confirmed members present as stated above.

OPENING STATEMENT

Councilman Ecton read the opening statement that describes the role of the Development Review Board and the procedures used in conducting this meeting.

MINUTE APPROVAL

November 17, 2005 DRB Study Session Minutes
November 17, 2005 DRB Regular Meeting Minutes

VICE-CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 17, 2005 STUDY SESSION AND REGULAR SESSION. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

Councilman Ecton noted that case 77-DR-2005 (6th Street Lofts) will be moved from the consent agenda to the regular agenda. Ms. Galav reported that changes have been made by the Applicant on case number 100-DR-2005 and has requested that the case be moved to the regular agenda. Ms. Galav noted that staff has not had an opportunity to review the new material and is therefore unable to make a recommendation to the Board regarding those items.

VICE-CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED THAT CASE 77-DR-2005 AND 100-DR-2005 BE MOVED TO THE REGULAR AGENDA.

Upon request for clarification by Board Member Jones, Ms. Galav confirmed that the requested changes to 100-DR-2005 are materials. The paint color has not changed. Ms. Galav noted that the Applicant has the material to distribute to the Board and reiterated that staff has not yet has the opportunity to review the changes.

SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER JONES, THE MOTION CARRIED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

CONSENT AGENDA

- | | | |
|----|--------------|---|
| 3. | 57-DR-1990#4 | Scottsdale Stadium Expansion
Site Plan & Elevations
7408 E. Osborn Road
City of Scottsdale - Applicant |
| 4. | 65-DR-2005 | Alltel WCF-Scottsdale Road & Dixileta Drive
Traffic Signal WCF
NEC Dixileta Drive & Scottsdale Road
Young Design Corp Architects, Architect/Designer |
| 6. | 82-DR-2005 | T-Mobile PH10919 WCF
Site Plan & Elevations
8250 E Rose Lane
CSI, Architect/Designer |

VICE-CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED TO APPROVE CASE NUMBERS 57-DR-1990#4, 65-DR-2005, 82-DR-2005. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

REGULAR AGENDA

- | | | |
|----|------------|---|
| 5. | 77-DR-2005 | 6th Street Lofts
Site Plan & Elevations
6937 E. 6th Street
Bonderud Architecture, Architect/Designer |
|----|------------|---|

Mac Cummins addressed the Board, noting the questions raised during the study session. He explained that the majority of the light exposure comes through the front windows, with the exception of the unit that fronts along 6th Street. He further explained staff's request that the metal screening be used in place of the canvas with regard to the awnings.

In response to inquiry by Board Member D'Andrea, Mr. Cummins confirmed that colored elevations are not available on all four sides of the project. The black and white elevations call out the various material samples and paint colors, which are identical around all four sides of the building. Board Member D'Andrea expressed concern in not having the opportunity to view how the colors elevation-ally interact with one another. He opined that the project is fine, overall. He whether an easement existed beyond the zero lot line and queried the opportunity of installing landscaping in that area, on the southern side.

Mr. Cummins explained that such landscaping would be a site planning issue, noting that the zoning district allows zero lot line construction and the Applicant has therefore placed the bulk of the open space along the two streets rather than abutting an adjacent property.

Board Member O'Neill noted specific options for the Applicant to consider, such as moving the building or eliminating the windows.

Sandra Bonderud, Bonderud Architecture, addressed the Board. In response to comments by Board Member O'Neill regarding options for rectifying the south elevation issues, Ms. Bonderud reported that the property is bordered by another R-5 property to the south consisting of a paved parking lot and parking structure for an adjacent apartment building. Her understanding of the zoning requirements are that if the building is to be moved, it would need to be moved five feet north, creating concerns that enough room would exist on the north side of the property to provide adequate landscaping in that section. She inquired as to any concerns the Board may have regarding the elimination of adequate landscaping space on the north side of the project.

Board Member O'Neill opined that moving the building five feet to the north would be a great solution. In response to inquiry, Mr. Cummins reported that setbacks are not required in the R-5 zone, however, in the event that a setback is created, it must meet a minimum distance requirement of ten feet.

Board Member Jones noted that in order to allow the windows to remain, the building would have to be moved 20 feet. He further expressed concerns about moving the building five feet and wondered if a better choice would not be to maintain a larger piece of landscaping to the north.

Mr. Cummins noted that an issue with the trash enclosure would be created if the whole building were to shift ten feet to the north.

In response to inquiry by Board Member O'Neill regarding options available to the Applicant, a brief discussion ensued, reiterating facts previously stated. Board Member O'Neill noted that the simplest solution appears to be the elimination of the windows on the south elevation. Ms. Bonderud informed that the Applicant is agreeable to the suggested solution.

Board Member Jones opined that the better choice for the Applicant is to build right to the property line and maintain space on the north side.

Councilman Ecton requested clarification regarding the awnings. Ms. Bonderud explained that she is in the process of researching the metal material, which would be an anodized aluminum in black or a powder coated aluminum in black.

Board Member O'Neill suggested that a Kinart finish would sustain in that location and on that material.

Board Member D'Andrea inquired regarding an opportunity to recess the windows, eliminating the need for the awnings. Ms. Bonderud noted plans for all of the windows to be recessed at least six inches, providing some relief. However, the windows are facing west and the awnings would assist shading.

BOARD MEMBER JONES MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF 77-DR-2005 WITH THE STIPULATIONS THAT NO WINDOWS BE ALLOWED ON THE SOUTH ELEVATION, AND THAT THE AWNINGS BE A METAL FINISH TO MATCH THE TRELLIS. SECONDED BY VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ , THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

7. 100- DR-2005 Main St Plaza - Building Improvements
 Changes to Exterior Skin
 7001 E. Main Street
 Lamb Architects, Architect/Designer

Tim Curtis presented the case per the staff packet. Highlights of the presentation included an aerial photo, zoning map, and slide of existing building conditions. Mr. Curtis explained the new changes to the roofing material now being proposed by the Applicant. Mr. Curtis noted staff's uncertainty with the proposed materials in relation to the context of the area.

In response to inquiry by Vice-Chairman Cortez, Mr. Curtis reported that some standing C-metal was approved on a project directly behind the subject property, but it has not been used on any other projects in the area.

Peter Petkas, Applicant, addressed the Board. He explained that the owner of the property presented the proposed changes at the last minute. Colored elevations and renderings were presented to the Board, along with an exhibit denoting the context of the area.

Kevin Rouse, representing the owner, addressed the Board. Councilman Ecton queried the status and reason for the proposed changes. Mr. Rouse expressed dissatisfaction with the overall color of the building and the desire of the owner to invest additional funds into the improvements.

Board Member D'Andrea queried the use of the stone and the metal roofing. Mr. Rouse confirmed that the same color scheme is being proposed. In response to inquiry by Board Member D'Andrea, Mr. Rouse confirmed that the proposal pertains to a change from a tile roof to a red metal roof and flagstone, stacked stone versus a slate tile.

Upon further discussion, Mr. Rouse indicated that the Applicant would consider taking the flagstone up the pillars on the corner element.

Board Member D'Andrea opined that the changes would be acceptable as long as the Applicant consider strengthening the corner element feature.

Board Member Jones opined that the previous tile roof was more compatible with the facade and is less in keeping with the rest of the block, seeming to demand a stronger argument than just a preference for the color. He inquired regarding the corneous piece on top of the roof. Mr. Rouse explained that this is an additional item, framed with foam and would be matched with the stucco finish. He also noted the possibility of painting that feature the lighter accent color, to draw some detail to top of the building.

Board Member Jones noted that the Board is having difficulty getting enthusiastic about the metal trim. He also noted that the Applicant does not have a drawing that reveals the entire facade, together as a composition, that explains what the building is going to be. Upon request for clarification by Mr. Rouse, Board Member Jones explained that he is not ready to approve the case based upon what has been presented.

Mr. Rouse clarified that the proposed roof color is actually a burgundy color versus a red color.

In response to a question of staff by Board Member O'Neill, Mr. Curtis stated that the use of manufactured stone in downtown is not encouraged. Board Member O'Neill requested that the Applicant consider the use of natural stone as opposed to a manufacturer stone. Mr. Rouse, noted that such would be a cost issue that would have to be evaluated.

Board Member Jones requested commentary from the Board, and opined that the project needs further study, and that the building should be more refined as opposed to informal.

Vice-Chairman Cortez concurred, also noting the fact that staff has not had the opportunity to analyze the proposed changes.

BOARD MEMBER JONES MOVED TO CONTINUE 100-DR-2005 FOR FURTHER STUDY AT THE NEXT MEETING. SECONDED BY VICE-CHAIRMAN CORTEZ.

In response to questions by Board Member O'Neill regarding delay to the project, Mr. Rouse confirmed that returning to the Board will not create significant delays to the project.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

8. 17-DR-DR-2004#3 The Mark & The Regency
(Formerly Residences on Main Street & Main Street Mews)
Changes to Exterior Skin
Main Street to 1st Street, 68th Street to 69th Street
Douglas Fredrikson Architects, Architect/Designer

Mr. Curtis presented the case per the staff packet. Highlights of the presentation included an aerial photo of the site, the zoning map, previously approved elevations, and proposed revised elevations. He noted staff's concerns regarding the proposed changes, the institutional look of the building, and the loss of the softer pedestrian aspects. Mr. Curtis presented bound materials to the Board.

Board Member D'Andrea noted that the project is under construction and that the proposed changes might have great impact on the systems. He queried how the project continues to move under construction off of a permitted set of plans on one design and at this point, are going to go to a complete separate design, with what are significant changes in the exterior of the building. He further noted the critical importance that this project be decided upon, one way or another. Mr. Curtis confirmed that time is of the essence and deferred to Mr. Tate regarding the details.

Mark Tate addressed the Board, providing a brief overview of the history of the project in relation to the proposed revisions. Addressing the question posed by Board Member D'Andrea, Mr. Tate explained that the structure of the building is straightforward and is cast in place. The structure of the skin does not really change. He noted that no changes are being proposed to the size or shape of the building.

Mr. Tate further presented an overview of reasoning behind the proposed changes. Highlights of Mr. Tate's presentation included photographs and material boards including character studies.

Board Member Jones expressed concerns about the present solution, which is described as being traditional and having a base that would be like sandstone, but not really sandstone. He opined that the color shift and the darkening at the pedestrian level certainly has some things to be said for it. However, expressed a need to be consistent and make things work together. He noted a conflict between traditional and contemporary, noting several specific instances thereto. He concluded that his overall reaction is that much of the detail has been lost and the project requires further refinement.

Mr. Tate expressed appreciation for the comments. He noted that Board Member Jones was absolutely correct in that the Applicant is attempting to use more traditional materials, to have more of a pedestrian feel, but in more of a contemporary massing and use of other materials. He conceded that the Applicant is crossing boundaries in an attempt to use a rustic modern type of approach.

Mr. Tate noted that the time crunch pertains to obtaining approval for heading in the specific direction of a more contemporary, rustic modern look as it relates to the building skin. He also noted that the project will return to building safety for approval and the building will not just be built in the field as it progresses along.

Board Member Jones requested clarification regarding what the Board is being asked to approve, noting that the project is in transition. He suggested the objective of determining how much the Board and Applicant can agree upon today in the spirit of reaching a resolution that allows the project to move forward. Board Member Jones requested input from fellow Board Members.

Board Member D'Andrea agreed with Board Member Jones, and opined that the project resembles a hospital, institutional box. He noted that there were elements in the previous design that tied the project together and supported a consistent theme with the architecture. He reiterated agreement with Board Member Jones regarding the fact that the project is almost there and would like to find solutions enabling the project to move forward.

Board Member Schmitt recalled some personal consternation about the direction of the design in the original project, as it related to the context of the area. He is not disappointed that the project is going in a slightly different direction, but shares the idea that it is a bit too institutional. He suggested softening it up and making it appear more residential rather than institutional. He noted the proposed alternative material method pertaining to the sandstone and expressed concern about making an approval for materials that have yet to be defined.

Board Member Schmitt also noted the appearance of changes in the floor plates on several levels of the building. Mr. Tate explained that the model builders that actually do the computer renderings do the off of AutoCAD drawings. The AutoCAD drawings were provided by the original architect. The AutoCAD drawings, do in fact reflect the design presented to the Board today. There has been a number of changes that have occurred in the construction documents, from the original building that was brought before the Board. He stated that the changes are minor and have to do with pop-outs, providing an example.

In response to request by Board Member Schmitt, Mr. Tate confirmed that what the Development Review Board approved originally on the project was changed somewhere along the way in the original construction documents. Mr. Tate stressed a desire to undo those changes and noted that the changes occurred during exploration of changing the skin of the building and trying to fix some of the skin issues that arose.

Board Member O'Neill suggested that the Applicant take the opportunity to revert back to the approved massing of the building; the approved DRB concept.

Board Member Jones encouraged that this project be restored somewhat to the massing the Board had seen before and inquired as to how to go about keeping the project moving and reporting back to the Board. Board Member Jones stressed the desire of approving a complete package at some point. Ms. Galav identified the options available to the Board, which included continuing the project. She noted that a potential problem could exist in trying to issue building permits if things in the project are not finalized. She cautioned that the Board consider how much detail they want to see modified.

Board Member D'Andrea noted that one of the larger problems is the continuation of construction and questioned what developer is building. Mr. Tate indicated that work is presently being completed underground; several levels of parking below the building.

Mr. Tate reiterated points previously made regarding the need to expend time to create the details that would return to Building Safety as a change and that those changes do not impact the structure of the building. Board Member D'Andrea noted concerns that people are working daily to arrive at a result that is unknown. Mr. Tate further argued points previously presented. Board Member D'Andrea reiterated concerns.

Mr. Tate noted the owners desire to upgrade the building as well as the fact that sales are in progress.

Councilman Ecton noted receipt of a comment card and invited Scott Lion to speak.

Scott Lion, West Rock Hospitality, developers, operators and owners of the Hotel Valley Ho, addressed the Board. He expressed concerns regarding the style and compatibility of the buildings since the project's inception. He expressed support and encouragement toward the proposed changes, noting that he considers them to be a refinement of the design.

Councilman Ecton expressed disappointment in the changes from the standpoint of the building. He noted that the Applicant has made changes that have not yet been addressed, and are without final resolution of what the project will ultimately look like. He also noted that additional changes have been made that have not even been mentioned, and wondered what else may have been changed that the Board is not aware of.

In response to a question by Councilman Ecton, Mr. Tate confirmed that the bay window is in fact still there; however, it is not provided with the detail above it. He explained that the muttons that were in the design that was originally approved are nothing more than a strip of metal on the inside of the windows and were not characteristic of a more contemporary style of architecture.

Councilman Ecton reiterated concerns about what other things have been changed that the Board is unaware of and that the Board does not have full knowledge of what is being approved or not approved today.

Mr. Tate reiterated the desire to move forward, at least in concept with moving to a more contemporary design.

Ms. Galav clarified the status of the project: currently, as it stands, the Applicant has to build what was approved by the Development Review Board with the original plan. Any changes to the architecture have to be approved by this Board. Stipulations on this case indicate that if the case is approved, then the DRB is approving the site plan as dated 11/10/2005, without any changes. She further explained that when staff gets into the approval of the documents, planning staff on the building safety side reviews for the architectural and the planning issues. Staff can not approve those plans if the details are unknown. It is not staff's policy to approve details while moving through the permitting process. Staff's recommendation is to have the Applicant return to the next meeting with a more definitive design, providing staff with something more to review and permit with.

Councilman Ecton, thanked Ms. Galav for the clarification and opined that staff, nor the Board want to operate this way on a regular basis.

BOARD MEMBER JONES MOVED TO CONTINUE CASE 17-DR-2004#3 ALLOWING THE ARCHITECT AND CLIENT TIME TO CONSIDER 1) ROUNDING THE EYEBROWS; 2) PROJECTING THE CORNOUS PIECE SOMEWHAT MORE TO DEVELOP A SHADOW LINE (WE'RE SEEING TWO OR THREE DIFFERENT CORNOUS ON THE ILLUSTRATIONS AND THERE IS SOME INCONSISTENCY

THERE); 3) ROUND THE SLAB AT THE ARCH THAT PROJECTS FROM THAT ARCH BASE, AGAIN TO ACHIEVE SOME CONSISTENCY THROUGHOUT THE PROJECT; 4) CURVE THE METAL BALCONY TO MATCH THE BASE FOR THOSE BALCONIES; 5) RESOLVE THE MATERIAL AND DETAILING OF THE BASE THAT'S INDICATED TO BE SANDSTONE LIKE; 6) EVALUATE WHAT CAN BE DONE TO REDEVELOP THE ORIGINAL MASSING THAT WAS APPROVED BY THIS BOARD. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA.

Councilman Ecton expressed concern regarding the sales occurring at the project without having a solid final design and inquired as to the status of the issue. Mr. Tate explained that the developer is providing buyers with exhibits for the approved design and for the proposed design, as an option. At this point, buyers are purchasing with either design option.

Board Member O'Neill inquired as to Mr. Tate's understanding of the points made, suggesting the possibility that the Board articulate the points into a stipulation. Mr. Tate confirmed his understanding of the points made.

Board Member Jones opined that the project can not be handled via stipulations. Randy Grant strongly agreed, noting that there is a great deal of lack of clarity and ambiguity. He suggested that four weeks as opposed to two, would be a realistic timeframe for the project to return to the Board.

Board Member O'Neill expressed that he will not be supporting the motion. He is unclear at the expressed lack of clarity, opining that the proposed changes are clear. He noted that the only unresolved question relates to the base material. He understands the design and believes it is communicated well.

Mr. Tate agreed with Board Member O'Neill and argued points previously stated. Board Member D'Andrea noted that the DRB approves elevations and site plans and assumes, by virtue of the fact that an architect is handling the project, that the details have been worked out. He noted that Mr. Tate's statements are in opposition to that statement, specifically noting that the details were not worked out in the previous plans that were submitted. Board Member D'Andrea stressed that it does not make sense for the Board to approve un-detailed plans and allow the project to move forward again where the details have not been worked out.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY A VOTE OF FIVE (5) TO ONE (1) WITH O'NEILL BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL DISSENTING.

In response to inquiry by Ms. Galav, Councilman Ecton suggested that the case return to the Board as soon as possible.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, being duly moved and seconded, the regular session of the Scottsdale Development Review Board adjourned at 2:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
A/V Tronics, Inc.